

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Previously, claims 1-29 and 33-44 were pending. In the Office Action mailed September 30, 2005, claims 26-29 and 33-44 are allowed and claims 1-25 are rejected. Accordingly, claims 1-29 and 33-44 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10-15, 18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of United States Patent No. 4,191,971 to Dischert et al. (hereinafter "Dischert").

The Examiner acknowledges that the Applicants' admitted prior art does not disclose a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. However, the Examiner asserts that Dischert teaches a system for connecting a plurality of video signals comprising a controller coupled to a video recorder for conditioning the video recorder according to a previously stored parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Dischert so that the controller is coupled to the Applicants' admitted prior art video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dischert teaches a setup control unit 27 that provides set up adjustments to the camera processors 21, 221 prior to an operational mode. The Examiner asserts that there is one setup control unit for each camera. Although the Examiner does not explicitly provide a conclusion based on the above assertion, it is implied that a setup control unit for each camera supplies the setup adjustments representative of the video signal received by either the camera processors 221 or 21. To support this assertion, the Examiner cites col. 2, lines 46-48 of Dischert, which teaches "one setup control for each of the cameras." The Applicants contend that the Examiner has mischaracterized the teachings of Dischert.

As distinctly supported in col. 2, lines 55-58 and lines 62-68, and in Figure 1 of Dischert, the statement within Dischert "one setup control for each of the cameras" means there is one

setup control, and this one setup control is connected to each of the cameras. Specifically, in col. 2, lines 55-58, Dischert teaches

“A transmission line cable 227 from the setup control unit 27 is looped through the camera processor 221 and through the camera processor 21 and is terminated at termination T1.”

As it is also clearly illustrated in Figure 1, a single setup control (setup control unit 27) is connected in series via a single cable (transmission line cable 227) to two camera processors (camera processors 221 and 21). Dischert does not teach one setup control unit per one camera processor. This is further substantiated in col. 2, lines 62-68 of Dischert, which teaches

“More cameras may be added to the system by simply disconnecting termination T1 and by connecting at the point of the termination a similar cable which is looped through another camera processor and terminated in similar manner. The transmission line cable 227 is tapped at a high impedance point along the line in the processor.”

Clearly, if another camera is added, the one setup control unit is still used to provide the same set up adjustments to the newly added camera that are provided to the other two cameras, since each of the cameras is connected in series to the same single setup control unit. Dischert does not teach that if another camera is added, another setup control unit is also added.

In summary, Dischert teaches a single setup control unit that provides the same set up adjustments to both camera processors. As such, both camera processors receive the same set up adjustments. Dischert does not teach providing set up adjustments specific to a select one of the camera processors.

In marked contrast to Dischert and the Applicants' admitted prior art, the apparatus of the present invention includes a modified video decoder 310 and controller 326 to provide previously stored parameters to the video decoder 310 for conditioning. The parameters provided by the controller 326 are specifically associated with a selected one of the video signals. In this manner, the video decoder 310 does not need to first process the selected one video signal in order to determine the parameters before conditioning itself. According to the present invention, the controller 326 obtains previously stored parameters associated with the selected one video signal,

and the controller 326 provides these parameters to the video decoder 310 for conditioning. The video decoder 310 is specifically configured to accept the parameters from the controller 326, and once accepted, to use the parameters to condition the video decoder 310 according to the selected one video signal associated with the accepted parameters.

The independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 1 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, neither the Applicants' admitted prior art, Dischert, nor their combination teaches a controller that conditions a video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert.

Claims 2-6 depend from the independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent claim 10 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 10 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a plurality of previously stored parameters representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, neither the Applicants' admitted prior art, Dischert, nor their combination teaches a controller that conditions a video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 10 is allowable over the teachings of Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert.

Claims 11-15, 18, and 22 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 11-15, 18, and 22 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 7, 16-17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,139 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter "Cooper"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 7, 16-17, and 23 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 7, 16-17, and 23 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 8-9 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,659 to Vincent (hereinafter "Vincent"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 8-9 and 24-25 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 8-9 and 24-25 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,167,021 to Holmes (hereinafter "Holmes"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 19-21 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 19-21 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

By: 

Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Dated: 11-28-05

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 11-29-05 By: 